

Sinclair Broadcasting's decision to force their stations to air an anti-Kerry documentary days before the election is a clear example of the dangers of media consolidation. I would not have an issue with this if both sides were being equally represented -- but in an election like this where it is so important that citizens be able to educate themselves about both candidates and so make a wise choice, it is grossly unfair of Sinclair to skew their material so drastically in favor of one candidate. Not to mention that they are *ordering* their affiliates to show it!

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest -- that means ALL sides, not just one. But when large companies control the airwaves, we get more of what's good for the bottom line (sensationalism, infotainment and sound bites) and less of what we need for our democracy (intelligent, thorough discourse about serious issues). Instead of something produced at "News Central" far away, it's more important that we see real people from our own communities and more substantive news about issues that matter.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard. Thank you.